

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

JOHN CODY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CORRECTIONS OFFICER KAREN
SLUSHER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 1:17-cv-132

ORDER

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Pro se Plaintiff John Cody filed a 168-page complaint (with 311 pages of exhibits) alleging prison abuse.¹ Because the complaint's heft made it impenetrable, the Court ordered Cody to file a streamlined complaint by March 14, 2019.² When Cody failed to do so, the Court extended the deadline to April 15th.³ After Cody missed that deadline too, the Court gave him until June 15th, cautioning that it would be his last chance.⁴

Yet, after 116 days, the nearly 500-page behemoth persists. Plaintiff Cody has repeatedly failed to file a "short and plain" statement as both Rule 8 and the Court's orders required.⁵ Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's case, without prejudice, for failure

¹ Doc. 1.

² Doc. 19 ("Cody's complaint does nothing but make his claims impossible to understand.").

³ Doc. 23.

⁴ Doc. 28.

⁵ Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) ("A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain . . . a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief."); *Muhammad v. Love's Travel Stops*, No. 3:18-cv-341, 2019 WL 2210770, *2 (S.D. Ohio May 22, 2019) (noting that an unduly long complaint ran afoul of Rule 8).

Case No. 1:17-cv-132
Gwin, J.

to prosecute.⁶

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 24, 2019

s/ *James S. Gwin*
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁶ See *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962) (Noting the inherent authority of federal trial courts to dismiss actions for failure to prosecute); *Rogers v. City of Warren*, 302 F. App'x 371, 375 (6th Cir. 2008) (Rule 41(b) “permits the court to involuntarily dismiss an action if a plaintiff fails . . . to comply with a court order”).